DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 849 JC 710 087

AUTHOR	Selo, Peter A.
TITLE	Interdistrict Arrangements for Student Flow and Regional Planning, California Community Colleges: Feasibility Study.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
REPORT NO	SR-71-1
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	48p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Attendance, *College Attendance, Enrollment, *Junior Colleges, *Regional Cooperation, *Regional Planning, Regional Programs, *Student Enrollment
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

Evidence indicates that present arrangements in California community college districts do not always provide the necessary mobility for students to attend college outside their own district. Current practices may encourage duplication of effort, especially with high-cost programs and/or low enrollment. This study is concerned with: (1) the identification and assessment of existing interdistrict arrangements for student flow and cooperative planning for joint programs and use of facilities; (2) descriptive analysis of fiscal, legal, jurisdictional, and attitudinal barriers that prevent expansion of interdistrict cooperation; (3) possible alternatives to minimize the major deterrents to cooperative planning and student flow; and (4) development of feasible arrangements in regional planning and cooperation for implementation by districts. (CA)

ED048849

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Feasibility Study
INTERDISTRICT ARRANGEMENTS FOR STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING
California Community Colleges

by

Dr. Peter A. Selo

Project Director

Staff Report 71-1
Office of the Chancellor
California Community Colleges

April 1971

JC 710 087

Prepared for

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges

and

Coordinating Council for Higher Education

State of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 26 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD i

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY 1

BACKGROUND 1
STUDY SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY 1
CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR STUDENT FLOW 2
CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR REGIONAL PLANNING 4
DETERRENTS TO STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING 6

Fiscal Deterrents 6
Legal Deterrents 7
Jurisdictional Deterrents 8
Attitudinal Deterrents 8

ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INCREASING STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING 9

Regional Residency 9
Regional Curricula 10

CHAPTER II: CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR STUDENT FLOW 11

CHAPTER III: CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR REGIONAL PLANNING . . 16

CHAPTER IV: DETERRENTS TO STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING 22

FISCAL DETERRENTS 22
LEGAL DETERRENTS 25
JURISDICTIONAL DETERRENTS 27
ATTITUDINAL DETERRENTS 28

CHAPTER V: ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INCREASING STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING 30

REGIONAL RESIDENCY (CLOSEST COLLEGE CONCEPT) 30
REGIONAL CURRICULA 31

APPENDICES 33

FOREWORD

This study was conducted under a Federal Comprehensive Facilities Planning Grant, administered by the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The general content of the study was suggested by a recommendation contained in the Council's 1969 Additional Centers Study.

The major findings and conclusions of the study are in Chapter I. Succeeding chapters deal in more detail with the many issues involved in providing equal educational opportunity to individuals regardless of their residence location, as well as the economically efficient provision of programs in adjacent Community College districts in California.

Findings describe current interdistrict attendance arrangements and extent of student flow between Community College districts. The extent of regional planning by districts is explored as well. In addition, the various existing deterrents to such arrangements are examined, including those of a fiscal, legal, jurisdictional, and attitudinal nature.

It is concluded that certain regional planning and student flow arrangements are feasible and, quite likely, desirable as well. The study suggests that further work on two kinds of regional planning and cooperation could improve the economic efficiency of Community Colleges while at the same time maintaining or improving the access of college programs to students.

The study was conducted by Dr. Peter A. Selo, working under contract to the Division of Fiscal Affairs, Financial Services Section of the Chancellor's Office. Advice was provided by the Technical Advisory Committee on Additional Centers and District Organization. In addition, assistance was also provided by staff of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the New England Board of Higher Education. Finally, we are grateful to the many individuals in Community College districts who gave generously of their time and provided the information upon which this study is based.

SIDNEY W. BROSSMAN
Chancellor

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

This study results from two actions of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Upon recommendation of its staff report, The Study of the Need for Additional Centers, February 1969, the Council advised the Chancellor's Office to undertake a study of regional planning for Community Colleges, including district organization, site acquisition, and construction of facilities. Subsequently, the Council approved a Federal Comprehensive Facilities Planning Grant for a study to examine the feasibility of interdistrict planning and cooperative arrangements. If this feasibility study proved successful, the Council expressed its intent to support a more comprehensive study to assist Community Colleges in planning facilities, programs, and activities on a regional basis.

Evidence indicates that present arrangements for student attendance between districts do not always provide the necessary mobility for students to attend college outside their district, despite legitimate educational and personal reasons for their request. In addition, current practices may encourage duplication of effort, most importantly in programs that are high cost and/or low enrollment.

STUDY SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The scope of this study includes (1) an identification and assessment of existing interdistrict arrangements for student flow and cooperative planning for joint programs and use of facilities; (2) a descriptive analysis of the fiscal, legal, jurisdictional and attitudinal barriers that prevent expansion of interdistrict cooperation; (3) possible alternatives to minimize the major deterrents to cooperative planning and student flow; and (4) the development of feasible arrangements of regional planning and cooperation for implementation by districts. The suggested arrangements could serve as pilot projects for the second phase of this study when additional funding becomes available.

The study is based upon two fundamental assumptions: (1) Community Colleges will continue to fulfill their present educational and community service functions and (2) specific recommendations for changes in district boundaries are not contemplated as part of the study.

Given these considerations, this study has been concerned primarily with an examination of current interdistrict arrangements for student flow and cooperative area planning. The 68 districts were grouped into 10 regional areas in order to assess adequately these multi-district activities. Within each of these "regions" information was gathered describing types and extent of cooperative planning as well as the nature and level of student flow between districts. Relevant literature was searched and the data that comprised the Board of Governors' staff study, "Report on the Need for Additional Community Colleges," November 1969, was reviewed. Updated information was collected from all districts on policies and procedures for student movement and cooperative planning. Conferences with the Technical Advisory Committee on Additional Centers and District Organization were held. Staff of the Coordinating Council assisted in the formulation of the study design and suggested areas for detailed review. Interviews and regional planning conferences with the staff and administrators of 30 districts were utilized to gain additional understanding of the problems and potentialities within each area. Time limitations prevented full consideration of each region; consequently, evidence of cooperative planning is limited to those districts that were contacted.

CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR STUDENT FLOW

One aspect of interdistrict planning involves the current arrangement for student flow between districts. Subject to general admission requirements, districts must admit students from other districts (i.e., other "districts of residence") unless such admission is contrary to the terms of an interdistrict attendance agreement or a notice of restriction. (In contrast, districts must admit, without qualification, all eligible students coming from areas in the state that are not in any Community College district.) Normally, interdistrict student exchange is regulated by the terms of such agreements negotiated by local districts. The law does not require the agreements, but nearly all districts exercise this option.

Sections of the Education Code (25505 - 25505.6) which regulate interdistrict attendance agreements as well as notices of restrictions provide considerable latitude for a district to negotiate such a compact. Each district determines its relationship with every other district in the state. Basic policy is the sole prerogative of the local board; and the law does not require any justification for the specific terms or format of any agreement. Consequently, most districts operate under several different types of contracts, reflecting local conditions as well as the degree of rapport between any two districts.

A review of all current interdistrict attendance agreements indicates considerable diversity regarding the terms and types of relationships among the 68 districts. However, the statewide picture reveals certain patterns that characterize most relationships. Fifty-nine of the 68 districts operate under a form of "free exchange" agreement involving only an exchange of state apportionment between the district of residence and the district of attendance for each student the latter educates. If there is or has been a severe imbalance in the exchange of dollars or numbers of students, then the pattern is to negotiate some form of a "cost contract" to remedy the situation. Thirty-six districts indicate they have "cost contracts" including not only the exchange of state apportionment for each student, but also payment, by the district of residence to the district of attendance of sufficient local tax dollars to meet the cost of educating the out-of-district student. Such agreements are found most often in areas characterized by a high cost of education, where there is a considerable differential between the level of state support and the actual cost of instruction and where there is active student interchange.

Between these two basic types of agreements, districts honor what they consider to be their educational commitment. Available evidence indicates that probably more students are exchanged under a no-cost agreement (free exchange) than a cost contract. However, cost contracts do not hinder cooperative planning among districts; in fact, they provide an excellent example of cooperation within existing constraints. The principle of local autonomy requires the district to fulfill the educational needs of its residents. If it is unable or unwilling to develop programs to meet these needs then it may release its residents to districts which can provide the necessary services. The usual means of discharging this responsibility involves a payment by the district of residence for the education of its constituents elsewhere. This arrangement has several advantages. It preserves the principle of local self-determination and occasionally saves local tax dollars since the cost of initiating a new program may exceed the cost of sending students to a district which has an established curriculum. Consequently, those regions -- San Diego, Los Angeles, Orange and Santa Clara Counties, and the San Francisco Bay Area -- noted for regional planning, have the largest numbers of cost contracts and lead other regions in the amount of student interchange.

Despite these facts, the relative amount of student interchange is nominal. Measured in current units of attendance (ADA), the amount of student interchange between regions ranges from 4.5% to 0.24% of total ADA. The statewide average is higher: 5.1% of total attendance takes place across district boundaries.

While the Community College is an open-door institution, there are definite admissions priorities implied in every interdistrict attendance agreement -- priorities which give local residents first claim

upon available educational resources. As noted, local residents are further protected through the legal right of the district to issue notices of restriction. If the community feels its educational program and fiscal integrity will be threatened through a large influx of residents of other districts, it may request the local board to issue such a notice to any or all districts in the state. Notices of restriction are also used to protect the very existence of a district. A new, recently-formed district usually has a highly restrictive policy because it lacks an adequate financial base to develop both the necessary facilities and programs to serve its own residents, while simultaneously releasing large numbers of students to ensure receiving the maximum amount of its share of state funds necessary for its operation. Under a policy of free flow, these new, normally small, districts would be faced with an egress of local residents, jeopardizing the very survival of the district.

Most districts maintain the best relations with adjacent districts. For example, restricted areas, such as Monterey Bay or Santa Clara County, will negotiate special agreements (either free exchange or reduced cost) with their immediate neighbors. This permits local districts not only to fulfill the responsibility to its own residents, but also to meet what it considers to be a regional responsibility of Community Colleges.

CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

A review of current interdistrict planning reveals that it is considerable in scope and varies according to the marked variations in local needs and conditions. The basic objectives of all such activities are to develop solutions to common problems, to maximize the service of the college to its community, and to reduce unnecessary duplication of effort. Generally, cooperative ventures are concentrated in urban, highly-populated areas which have common interests and problems and where the high cost of education, relative equality of wealth, and proximity of numerous districts make such activity not only practical but vital. Regions characterized by sparse population, considerable distance among districts, as well as significant variations in wealth and interests are not as active as their urban counterparts.

The greatest amount of activity centers around curriculum planning -- especially in the vocational-technical fields. Much cooperative planning has emerged from such organizations as: the Bay Area Vocational Coordination Committee, the San Joaquin Valley Community

College Council for Occupational Education, and the San Diego Area Community College Vocational Planning Committee. The geographical expanse represented by these organizations does not preclude intra-regional and local subcommittees or special interdistrict ventures with the same goals as the larger groups. Member districts are usually represented by deans of instruction or vocational education.

Recently, the scope of such planning efforts has included cooperative use of public or private facilities or agencies (such as hospitals for training in health occupations) and the development of multi-district library cooperatives and instructional television consortia. The cost of these operations usually is shared among participating districts. To further the effectiveness of the Community Colleges, many urban districts have formed articulation committees which include the local high schools, colleges and universities. The purpose of such meetings is to coordinate curricula, provide for common counseling, standardize admission requirements and to facilitate the transfer of students to four-year institutions. The success of these conferences varies with the willingness and ability of its members to cooperate because these, as well as all other forms of interdistrict planning, are basically voluntary.

Many districts have conducted and funded joint projects such as common computer facilities, studies of student characteristics, and comprehensive regional studies to determine the optimum location of campuses, as well as the types of curricula to serve the future needs of the area. The most current and interesting developments have been in the area of local board involvement and community services. Recognizing the function and authority of the local board, some districts are attempting to increase the awareness of common problems and commitment to cooperative planning by local trustees through formation of organizations composed of board members from several adjoining districts or holding joint board sessions. This emphasis upon cooperation has stimulated the service functions of Community Colleges. Assisted by federal and state funds, colleges have developed a wide range of programs for educationally and culturally deprived, such as remedial skill centers and cooperative internships to train ethnic minorities to assume greater positions of responsibility in society.

The original purpose of this study was to examine the feasibility of interdistrict cooperation and regional planning. All available evidence indicates that interdistrict cooperation is definitely feasible because it is, in fact, operational. The problem, therefore, is not so much to determine feasibility of cooperative planning as it is to identify those areas where expansion of existing planning activities would lead to greater student access and more effective provision of programs.

DETERRENTS TO STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Fiscal Deterrents

Current methods of funding Community Colleges reflect the principle of local self-determination but acts as a significant deterrent to increased student movement and regional planning. Local boards are faced with a decline in state support, sharply accelerating total cost of education, and projected enrollments that in most districts outstrip the local tax base required to support them. Further, local taxpayers who support approximately 60% of the current cost have exhibited an unwillingness to increase that burden, as indicated by recent tax and bond elections. Under these conditions, districts are not motivated to commit large sums of local operating funds to support the substantial costs of free flow and regional planning.

Procedures for distribution of state apportionment and capital outlay funds encourage districts to retain rather than release students. The district share of state apportionment is computed by the number of residents within the district. For every student permitted to enroll elsewhere, district of residence automatically loses all state funds for that resident. Moreover, this problem is compounded by the present system which favors the wealthy district and penalizes its less fortunate neighbor. A wealthy district usually receives little state aid because it possesses sufficient local resources to reach the foundation guarantee of $643 per ADA. The poor district, however, not only qualifies for basic aid ($125 per ADA) but also significant state equalization funds to reach the foundation guarantee. Consequently, a poor district loses considerably more state assistance for every unit of ADA it releases than its wealthy neighbor. Because of this inequity, the poor district with fewer resources may find it less expensive to retain the student at home and refuse to grant a release thereby denying its own residents the breadth of educational opportunity often provided by a wealthier district. The wealthy district, however, may profit from this situation if its cost of education exceeds the foundation guarantee. In this instance, the loss in state aid for each out-of-district student may be far less than the cost of developing a new program.

Wealthy districts do have an incentive to accept students from less-wealthy districts. This is because the amount of state aid for each student moving from a low-wealth district (A) to a high-wealth district (B) is based upon the (lower) wealth of district A. Movement

of students from district B to district A is discouraged for exactly the same reason; i.e., the calculation and apportionment of state funds according to district of residence, rather than district of enrollment.

Attempts to solve these financial deterrents would need to replace the inequities of the present system with fiscal incentives for regional planning. One possibility to be considered is the calculation and apportionment of state aid on the basis of a student's district of attendance, rather than his district of residence. Under this plan, state aid would be paid to districts where students are actually generating program costs. Another alternative would provide for a uniform statewide property tax levy. A third possibility to explore is eliminating any exchange of funds that normally would result from student transfers. This alternative, perhaps including some state subsidy to assist districts in maintaining expensive programs, provides another approach to overcoming current fiscal incentives. Implications of these and other alternatives would need to be studied fully prior to implementation.

Legal Deterrents

Local districts may exercise only powers specifically delegated to them or necessarily implied from these expressed powers. Negotiating a compact which includes planning curricula on a regional basis and permitting a free flow of students among districts to take advantage of educational opportunities constitutes a legitimate exercise of such powers. However, a district must maintain its schools within its own territory (Sec. 5011, Ed.C.) except in very restricted circumstances (Sec. 5022 - 5031, Ed.C.). These provisions effectively prohibit the construction and maintenance of permanent and comprehensive facilities outside district territory. Public agencies can execute a joint powers agreement (Sec. 6502, Gov. Code), but it cannot be utilized by school districts for operating of a comprehensive permanent facility outside their boundaries. In any joint venture of this nature, the facility would be out-of-district for most participants and, thus, the cooperating districts would be exceeding their legal powers. Moreover, state construction funds are available only to "districts." The joint powers agency created to operate this comprehensive facility is not a "district" and, therefore, is ineligible for state financial assistance. The Education Code does not provide for sharing responsibilities and liabilities of jointly constructed and operated facilities. Application of Education Code provisions to joint operations would create difficulties in relation to taxing, bonding, and other matters.

Jurisdictional Deterrents

Student movement between districts and effective regional planning requres a commitment from local boards, administrators and communities. This commitment requires a willingness to participate in cooperative endeavors with other districts in addition to responding to the needs and preferences of the local community. The commitment also requires that districts consider the needs and efforts of their neighbors and the state. Available evidence suggests that districts generally have been unwilling to expand sufficiently the range of their planning about curricula and fiscal affairs in order to bring about a viable regional operation. Historically, local boards have established policy for their district, and have seldom been required to consider larger area or statewide concerns.

Thus, the problem of possible permanent cooperative ventures raises the following questions: Who would control the curriculum and facilities? Would out-of-district students be given equal treatment with residents? How would conflicting board policies be resolved? How to cope with serious community pressure? What would be the penalties for withdrawal? Given the fact of local autonomy and board control, what would prevent a district from refusing to accept a decision of a regional agency? What portion of the local budget should be expended on such a venture without serious concerns from the community?

Attitudinal Deterrents

Basic to the Community College function is service to its community or district. There is no common definition of a "community," but district boards, administrators and residents tend to emphasize differences rather than similarities among adjoining areas. There is a tendency to protect and preserve local traditions. District boards and administrators will consider their residents primarily because of fiscal reality. Approximately two-thirds of the funding of Community Colleges is derived from local revenue. Consequently, a district has a responsibility to the local taxpayer. This tends to discourage free flow and regional planning since otherwise district taxpayers would be paying for the education of students from other districts. This tends to dilute the educational opportunities and community benefits that taxpayers may derive from their own local college.

ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INCREASING STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING

The following alternatives are designed to alleviate two interrelated problems: (1) the case of the student who is unable to obtain a desired program due either to the unwillingness of the district of residence to grant a release or reluctance on the part of another district to admit the student to its college(s); and (2) the district that cannot fund certain programs due to high initial or fixed cost and possibly low enrollment. These alternative arrangements would incorporate the need for maximum flexibility because of differences in local conditions. They are not totally new or untried. A few districts currently operate modified forms of these exchange and planning arrangements. Implementation of these alternatives would permit empirical evaluation of an untested assumption: regional planning and interdistrict cooperation will maintain or possibly increase present levels of student access and community service while increasing economic efficiency. Implementation also will require funding for staff planning and coordination beyond that for which districts currently budget.

Regional Residency

This alternative would permit a simple but comprehensive student exchange based upon proximity, and offer students an opportunity to attend a college in another district when that college is geographically accessible. Such a plan could be coordinated on a regional level by a joint powers agency which would agree upon the number of eligible students who could be accommodated at the colleges within the region. No restrictions would be placed on enrollment because of the participant's residence or his reasons for requesting admission. The major objective would be to establish a reciprocal attendance policy based upon student need.

The concept of regional residency would seem to be most applicable to a region which has few districts that may be large in area but small in enrollments and where factors of geography, inadequate local resources, and isolation constitute serious deterrents to meeting the educational needs of the region.

Regional residency possesses many of the same advantages as the regional curricula concept. In fact both arrangements can be used together. However, regional residency has the added benefit of

increasing access. It would be particularly effective for students living near district borders where a natural flow is frequentiy curbed by an interdistrict attendance agreement. Finally, it recognizes the true service area of a Community College without undue regard to district boundaries.

Regional Curricula

This alternative is based upon area-wide agreements to establish specific high cost programs at designated colleges. The selection of "regional curricula" would be based upon the desire of districts to increase regional visibility for outstanding programs or recruit additional students for high cost and/or under-enrolled curricula. Implementing this alternative could involve the creation of a joint powers agency by participating districts to develop a curriculum plan for the region based upon present facilities and future area needs. District representatives would identify regional curricula, indicate the number of spaces available to out-of-district students, and arrange for a regional counselling program to advertise the opportunities. Periodically, district representatives would review and revise the regional curricula based upon demand and evaluation of existing programs. Finally, a series of interdistrict attendance agreements could regulate enrollment in these curricula according to pre-arranged enrollment priorities.

Programs selected as regional curricula would normally be high cost, often exhibiting low enrollments (particularly if offered in adjacent districts), and show evidence of substantial community need, but which cannot be totally funded by a single district. The best pilot project or test of this alternative would be in a high-population-density urban area with sufficient number of districts to generate the required enrollment.

The specific programs might be funded under full-cost reimbursement contracts to eliminate possible financial disadvantages faced by the host district; or total state funding might be appropriate, particularly in those cases where manpower needs have been clearly demonstrated.

This alternative has several advantages. It emphasizes program excellence, expands educational opportunity, and tends to reduce unit costs by concentrating enrollments in certain programs. It not only permits each district to maintain its authority over curricula but also avoids the jurisdictional issue raised by joint operation of a common facility.

CHAPTER II
CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR STUDENT FLOW

One aspect of interdistrict planning involves the current arrangement for student flow between districts. Subject to general admission requirements, districts must admit students from other districts (i.e., other "districts of residence") unless such admission is contrary to the terms of an interdistrict attendance agreement or a notice of restriction. (In contrast, districts must admit, without qualification, all eligible students coming from areas in the state that are not in any Community College district.) Normally, interdistrict student exchange is regulated by the terms of such agreements negotiated by local districts. The law does not require the agreements, but nearly all districts exercise this option. If a district decides not to negotiate a contract and issues no notices of restriction, then it permits virtually open-enrollment. Available evidence indicates that only one of the sixty-eight districts has chosen not to seek agreements.

The legal basis for present arrangements is found in Sections 25505 - 25505.6 of the Education Code. (See Appendix B) Normally, interdistrict attendance is regulated by the terms of a contract negotiated by local districts. The essential requirements for a valid contract are stipulated in the Code; these include the range of charges to be levied, the minimum duration of an agreement and the conditions which exempt a district from the fee for use of facilities ("seat tax"). Each district determines its relationship with every other district. Basic policy is the sole prerogative of the board and the law does not require any justification for the specific terms or format of any agreement. Consequently, many districts operate under several different types of contracts which reflect local conditions as well as the degree of rapport between any two districts. Once a contract is issued, the receiving district must decide if it will accept, reject, or renegotiate the agreement. Usually, districts attempt to work within the terms of a contract, but if this appears impossible, a notice of restriction may be issued.

A district may restrict admission of its residents in a Community College of another district or restrict admission of residents of another district into its Community College or colleges by means of a notice of restriction (Section 25505.5). The duration of this notice is the prerogative of the issuing district and the receiving district "shall not permit attendance contrary to the notice."

The notice of restriction effectively denies access to any "regular student"[1] who wishes to enroll for any reason in a Community College included in the notice. The only legal remedy open to a potential enrolee is an appeal to the County Board of Education which has the power to override a valid interdistrict attendance agreement or notice of restriction (Section 25505.6).

A review of all current interdistrict attendance agreements indicates considerable diversity in the terms and types of relationships among the sixty-eight districts.[2] However, the statewide picture reveals certain patterns that characterize most relationships. Fifty-nine of the sixty-eight districts operate under a form of "free exchange" agreement involving only an exchange of state apportionment between the district of residence and the district of attendance for each student the latter educates. If there is or has been a severe imbalance in the exchange of dollars or numbers of students, then the pattern is to negotiate some form of a "cost contract" to remedy the situation. Thirty-six districts indicate they have "cost contracts" including not only the exchange of state apportionment for each student, but also payment by the district of residence to the district of attendance of sufficient local tax dollars to meet the cost of educating the out-of-district student. Such agreements are found most often in areas characterized by a high cost of education, where there is a considerable differential between the level of state support and the actual cost of instruction and where there is active student interchange.

The"full cost contract" requires the district of residence to pay the district of attendance its current expense of education plus a specified charge for the use of its facilities (seat tax) for each out-of-district student it educates. The "tuition contract" follows the same pattern but eliminates the facility fee. These charges are levied at the discretion of the district of attendance but may not exceed the limits imposed by Sections 20201 and 25505.4 of the Code. The terms of a cost contract are somewhat mitigated by clauses which allow for an increase of out-of-district residents at less than full cost. Most districts will accept a limited number of units of ADA on a free exchange basis. This appears to range from a minimum of three in districts such as Marin, Foothill, Monterey or Cabrillo to a maximum of fifty between the San Francisco and Peralta districts.

---

[1]This does not apply to any student living more than 90 miles from the nearest "public Community College attendance center." (Section 25514.5)

[2]See Appendix C, Table I: "Interdistrict Attendance Agreements" for further detail concerning the type and location of exchange contracts.

Between the two major types of agreements - free exchange and cost - districts honor what they consider to be their educational commitment. Available evidence indicates that probably more students are exchanged under a no-cost agreement (free exchange) than a cost contract. One possible reason for this is that cost contracts can hinder a student's access, especially if he is a resident of a "poor" district that cannot afford to meet the financial obligations of this type of agreement. However, cost contracts do not hinder cooperative planning among districts; in fact, they provide an excellent example of cooperation within existing constraints. The principle of local autonomy requires the district to fulfill the educational needs of its residents. If it is unable or unwilling to develop programs to meet these needs then it may release its residents to districts which can provide the necessary services. The usual means of discharging this responsibility involves a payment by the district of residence for the education of its constituents elsewhere. This arrangement has several advantages. It preserves the principle of local self-determination and occasionally saves local tax dollars since the cost of initiating a new program may exceed the cost of sending students to a district which has an established curriculum. Consequently, those regions -- San Diego, Los Angeles, Orange and Santa Clara Counties, and the San Francisco Bay Area -- noted for regional planning, have the largest numbers of cost contracts and lead other regions in the amount of student interchange.

All residents of a district who wish to enroll in another district must obtain an interdistrict attendance permit. Permits are granted pursuant to district policy and the current interdistrict exchange agreement. Permits are issued usually on an individual basis to maintain the exchange ratio stipulated in the interdistrict attendance agreement and provide data on the reasons for student movement. Many districts also have agreements that do not require residents of either district to obtain a permit. These "blanket" arrangements allow virtual open enrollment and merely involve the exchange of state apportionment. The liberality of such contracts severely limits their use. Normally, they are negotiated only if student exchange is minimal or if both districts can derive fiscal and educational benefits from the arrangement. Consequently, there is a positive relationship between these agreements and the factor of distance. The frequency of blanket arrangements usually is directly proportionate to the number of miles between the districts. For example, there is little problem between Lassen Community College District and Imperial Community College District. However, the blanket agreement is found also among adjacent districts. Los Angeles and Santa Monica Community College Districts have defined a blanket area which is mutually beneficial. The heavy flow from Los Angeles to Santa Monica (about 4800 units of ADA) subsidizes the latter and saves Los Angeles the expense of constructing a campus in the area.

Policies governing the interdistrict exchange of students indicate the district's concern for the educational development of the community. Ninety-five percent of all districts issue releases for a specific course or curriculum unavailable within the district; 83% consider evidence of personal or financial hardship sufficient justification for a permit while 63% grant a request if the out-of-district facility is closer to a resident than the nearest in-district college. Part-time and evening students normally are granted a release for nearly all of these reasons.[1]

Despite these facts, the relative amount of student interchange remains nominal. Measured in current units of attendance (ADA), only 5.2% of the total statewide attendance takes place across district boundaries. The amount of intraregional student interchange ranges from 0.2% to 3.5% of total ADA. Interregional student flow varies from 0.9% to 10.5%.[2] A comparison of intraregional and interregional flow indicates that student movement seems to be from rural to urban areas. There are many probable reasons for this phenomenon. Rural districts frequently lack the wealth as well as the breadth of educational opportunity of the urban area. Access to established Community College programs, senior institutions, and job opportunities are normally greater in an urban region. However, existing data do not provide adequate answers to several important questions. The actual magnitude of the problem of student access in California remains unknown. Definitive reasons for student movement are lacking. Further, there is insufficient evidence to establish a significant correlation between the willingness and ability of students to attend a Community College. These problems require further investigation if regional planning of curricula, facilities, and sites is to correspond to the actual needs of an area.[3]

---

[1] See Appendix C, Tables I and II.

[2] See Appendix C, Table III.

[3] One possible approach to gather this information would be an analysis of areas and/or curricula that are susceptible to open enrollment, adequate counselling, and student follow-up. The Northern California Area Planning Council (Butte, Feather River, Lassen, Shasta, Siskiyous and Yuba Community Colleges) are engaged in a project to prepare career planners and increase the articulation with feeder high schools in the region. Part of the project might involve the development of data on program and college preferences for potential students in the area.

Although the Community College is an open-door institution, it must give its local residents first claim upon available educational resources. Consequently, there are definite admissions priorities implied in every interdistrict attendance agreement. Such priorities may be accomplished by placing a simple limit on the number of out-of-district enrolees, filling desired programs with district residents, sharply increasing costs for non-district residents, or refusing admission to an out-of-district resident, even if he (or she) possesses a valid interdistrict attendance permit. Local residents are protected through the administration of interdistrict attendance agreements. It is the sole prerogative of the district of residence to determine the number of students it will release to attend colleges in another district. The final acceptance of a student released under a valid interdistrict attendance agreement is contingent upon the approval of the proposed district of attendance.

Local residents are further protected through the legal rights of the district to issue notices of restriction. If the community feels its basic identity, educational program, or fiscal integrity will be threatened through a large influx of residents of other districts, it may request the local board to issue such a notice to any or all districts in the state. Notices of restriction are also used to protect the very existence of a district. A new, recently-formed district usually has a highly restrictive policy because it lacks an adequate financial base to develop both the necessary facilities and programs to serve its own residents, while simultaneously releasing large numbers of students to ensure receiving the maximum amount of its share of state funds necessary for its operation. Under a policy of free flow, these new, normally small, districts would be faced with an egress of local residents, jeopardizing the very survival of the district.

Most districts maintain their best relations with adjacent districts. For example, restricted areas, such as Monterey Bay or Santa Clara County, will negotiate special agreements (either free exchange or reduced cost) with their immediate neighbors. This permits local districts not only to fulfill the responsibility to its own residents, but also to meet what it considers to be a regional responsibility of Community Colleges.

Current procedures for student flow partly reflect the methods of district organization and the present system of funding California's Community Colleges. Some district officials have indicated that current arrangements occasionally perplex and frustrate both district residents and administrators. However, comprehensive changes in present procedures for student interchange should not be contemplated until other overriding fiscal and organizational problems are examined.

CHAPTER III
CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

A review of current interdistrict planning reveals that it varies according to local needs and conditions. The basic objectives of all such activity are to develop solutions to common problems, to maximize the service of the college to its community, and to reduce unnecessary duplication of effort. Generally, cooperative ventures are concentrated in urban, highly-populated areas which have common interests and problems and where the high cost of education, relative equality of wealth, and proximity of numerous districts make such activity not only practical but vital. Regions characterized by sparse population, considerable distance among districts, as well as significant variations in wealth and interests are not as active as their urban counterparts.

The greatest amount of activity centers around curriculum planning -- especially in the vocational-technical fields.[1] Much cooperative planning has emerged from such organizations as: the Bay Area Vocational Coordination Committee, the San Joaquin Valley Community College Council for Occupational Education, and the San Diego Area Community College Vocational Planning Committee. The geographical expanse represented by these organizations does not preclude interregional and local subcommittees or special interdistrict ventures with the same goals as the larger groups. Member districts are usually represented by deans of instruction or vocational education. A review of the recent activities of these groups suggests that the majority of the area planning is confined to an interdistrict exchange of information concerning present and proposed programs for occupational education and apprenticeship training.[2] Brochures are printed describing the programs as well as their location. Manpower

---

[1] This emphasis upon regional planning for occupational education has been fostered by federal, state and local agencies that have provided some necessary services as well as part of the financial support to assist the Community Colleges in their educational mission.

[2] This information was obtained from an analysis of the minutes of meetings and interviews with area planning coordinators. Attendance and participation in these meetings provided additional insight.

advisory committees composed of potential employees as well as representatives of the State Department of Human Resources are utilized to gain some input for program planning.[1]

There is some indication of comprehensive research by the districts for the proper allocation of curricula to meet area needs. However, these efforts need to be expanded at the area-wide level for maximum benefit. Districts are willing to undertake such work but they lack the incentive, funds, and staff to undertake the necessary studies. Available evidence also reveals little formal commitment for area-wide program allocation by member districts. Undue emphasis seems to be placed upon the establishment of "prestige" curricula at the expense of the "less desirable" programs.

There is a direct correlation between the level of fiscal and educational commitment by the districts and the availability of federal or state funds for such purposes. The development of the San Joaquin Valley Community College Council for Occupational Education attests to this. Member districts have contributed directly to its operation, but the decline of state and federal support has caused concern about the ability of these districts to increase and prolong this commitment. During the last two years, however, staff has been able to complete several important projects including an inventory of occupational programs of the San Joaquin Valley and a survey of manpower needs at the state and local levels within each occupational group, as well as the allocation of programs to meet those needs. The Council has also initiated a pilot program of student interchange for the region. It allows a limited number of students (6) to enroll in a vocational program in another Council college if that curriculum is unavailable in the district of residence. The program not only provides the usual counselling services, but also any necessary assistance to overcome the problems of relocation. This student interchange program is financed through no-cost interdistrict attendance agreements among the member districts to cover the cost of the 66 spaces reserved under this plan.

---

[1]The input from the Department of Human Resources Development is limited for Community Colleges purposes because its analysis is restricted to job opportunities filled by its own placement services. Consequently, the information available concerning technical and semi-professional or professional careers (such as scientific technicians, nurses and engineers) is too general for planning purposes. See California Manpower Needs to 1975, Sacramento 1969.

Future plans involve such activities as the development of Council-approved consulting teams to aid member districts in program and facilities planning, an expansion of the student interchange program, and the establishment of a regional master plan. Unfortunately, the decline in the level of local and state funding threatens the very existence of the Council and could curtail or cancel its plans for the following year.

In addition to funding, another reason for the success of this and other area planning groups is the involvement of the upper levels of district administration. As noted above, member districts are usually represented by deans of instruction or vocational education -- an appropriate function for these officials. However, the necessary authority to make the financial and educational commitment to implement realistic area planning is the prerogative of the local boards. There are indications that the degree of success of these regional planning consortia is often related to the degree of active participation by trustees, superintendents and presidents. An example of this is the Northern Area Planning Council.[1] From a modest beginning in 1968, this group has made substantial progress in recent months. Last fall, council members advised their superintendents that further planning efforts required the latter's immediate involvement. The active and positive response of the superintendents had definite benefits. In less than five months, the Northern Area Planning Council has developed the outline of a comprehensive regional plan, committed a specified amount of state apportionment to finance its operation, and is currently seeking enabling legislation to reduce the fiscal barriers for regional planning and further the development of long-range objectives for the region.

Recently, the scope of cooperative planning has expanded. Nearly all districts utilize public or private facilities to extend their curricula. Hospital and clinical facilities support training in the health occupations. Computer centers, airports, and business establishments supplement comprehensive programs in many districts. A number of districts - Marin, Napa and Sonoma, West Valley and San Jose, Los Angeles and Santa Monica - have developed cooperative arrangements to accommodate excess enrolees and thereby delay the need for additional colleges. Several districts are involved in multidistrict library cooperatives and instructional television consortia. Districts in San Diego and the San Gabriel Valley have developed an area library cooperative as part of a statewide organization (California Community College Library Cooperative). The original feasibility study conducted by Science and Accounting

---

[1]The Butte, Peralta (Feather River College District), Feather River, Lassen, Shasta, Siskiyous and Yuba Community College Districts.

Systems, Inc. and the current operations have been funded by member districts.[1] The two major instructional television consortia involve a similar arrangement. One spans Los Angeles and Orange Counties; the second encompasses portions of Alameda, Santa Clara, San Jose and San Mateo Counties.[2] Both consortia depend upon district funds. Each member college of the southern group pays $2,000 in annual dues. The contributions of the Bay Area consortium depend upon the number of enrolees from each college. Initially, these consortia have offered courses in law, psychology, health and history. Preliminary evaluation of the arrangement suggests definite educational and economic advantages.[3]

To further the effectiveness of Community Colleges, some districts have formed articulation committees which include the local high schools, colleges and universities. The purpose of such meetings is to coordinate curricula, provide for common counselling, standardize admission requirements and facilitate the transfer of students to four-year institutions. Although many districts are involved in these activities, the San Diego County Community College Association appears to have had the greatest success in this area, especially in the transfer of their graduates to nearby senior institutions. The success of these conferences varies with the willingness and ability of its members to cooperate because these, as well as other forms of interdistrict planning, are basically voluntary and have no other incentive than a commitment to increase educational opportunity. Some districts, especially in San Diego County, have conducted and funded joint projects such as common computer facilities, studies of student characteristics; others, such as Marin, Sonoma and Napa have developed comprehensive regional studies to determine the optimum location of campuses, as well as the types of curricula to serve the future needs of the area.

---

[1] Members include Chaffey, Citrus, Cypress, Fullerton, Glendale, Mount San Antonio, Pasadena and Rio Hondo Community College Districts. See Science and Accounting Systems, Inc. CCLC Phase I Report, (May 1969)

[2] The southern consortia includes Compton, El Camino, Orange Coast, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Pasadena, Rio Hondo, Santa Ana and Santa Monica Community College Districts, representing ten districts and eighteen colleges. The northern group involves seven colleges in five districts: Foothill, Fremont-Newark, San Jose, San Mateo and South County.

[3] An evaluation report (1969-1970) from Chabot College indicates that its average cost per student was $26.14 as compared with about $41.00 per student enrolled in a similar day course on the campus.

The most current and interesting developments have been in the area of local board involvement and community services. Recognizing the function and authority of the local board, some districts are attempting to increase the awareness of common problems and commitment to cooperative planning by local trustees through formation of organizations composed of board members from several adjoining districts or holding joint board sessions. The Fremont-Newark Board of Trustees is attempting to form an association known as "The Bay Area Community College Trustees Organization." Proposed membership includes trustees from the following Community College districts: Contra Costa, Foothill, Gavilan, Marin, Napa, Peralta, San Francisco, San Jose, San Mateo, South County Joint, Solano, and Sonoma. The purpose of this organization would be to discuss problems of mutual interest: student activism, local control, salaries, employment, staff retention, curriculum and budgets. The initial organizational meeting took place January 22, 1971 and represents the first major effort in this area to involve the trustees more actively in regional affairs.

Oceanside-Carlsbad and Palomar have made significant advances in board cooperation. Not only do their boards hold occasional joint sessions, but the policies of each district reflect an acquaintance with the problems and potentialities of the neighboring district. A unique pilot project is being proposed for student interchange between the two districts. This proposal would permit <u>all</u> students of either district to attend the college of their choice without obtaining prior approval from their district of residence. The operation would be financed under a blanket agreement for fiscal 1971-1972. Its objective is to measure the problems and potentialities of totally free student flow under existing constraints. This project is the first comprehensive plan for <u>total</u> student interchange between any two adjacent districts in the state and replaces district competition with cooperation.

Emphasis on cooperation has stimulated the service functions of Community Colleges. Assisted by federal and state funds, colleges have developed a wide range of extended opportunity programs for the educationally and culturally deprived. Three districts - San Jose, West Valley and Fremont-Newark - cooperating with the State Department of Rehabilitation, have initiated a pilot program for the vocational rehabilitation of the physically and/or mentally handicapped. Chaffey Community College is operating a remedial skills center for the educationally deprived in its area. The Model Cities Program at Southwestern College, the involvement of Grossmont College with the local indian reservations, and the Program for Administrative Trainees sponsored by Contra Costa, Peralta, and South County Community College Districts, indicate the response of the Community College to the needs of society.

The original purpose of this study was to examine the feasibility of interdistrict cooperation and regional planning. All available evidence indicates that interdistrict cooperation is definitely feasible because it is, in fact, operational. The problem, therefore, is not so much to determine feasibility of cooperative planning as it is to identify those areas where expansion of existing planning activities would lead to greater student access and more effective provision of programs. Variations in local conditions as well as the nature of the Community College suggest several approaches to interdistrict cooperation. Therefore, any approach or combination of methods that will foster the objectives of interdistrict planning and cooperation must be considered as a legitimate alternative.

CHAPTER IV
DETERRENTS TO STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Regional planning and interdistrict flow of students may be hindered by fiscal, legal, jurisdictional and attitudinal deterrents.

FISCAL DETERRENTS

Current methods of funding Community Colleges reflect the principle of local self-determination but act as significant deterrents to increased student movement and regional planning. Local boards are faced with a decline in state support, sharply accelerating total cost of education, and projected enrollments that in most districts outstrip the local tax base required to support them. Further, local taxpayers who support approximately two-thirds of the current cost have exhibited an unwillingness to increase that burden, as indicated by recent tax and bond elections. Under these conditions, districts are not motivated to commit large sums of local operating funds to support the substantial costs of free flow and regional planning. Procedures for distribution of state apportionment and capital outlay funds encourage districts to retain rather than release students. This is partly because current methods do not provide total equalization; they tend to favor the wealthy district. State support is based upon the local wealth of the district measured by the assessed valuation per unit of average daily attendance (AV/ADA). The following hypothetical example illustrates the way in which the Foundation Program provides only partial equalization.

	District A	District B
Average Daily Attendance (ADA)	2,000	2,000
Assessed Valuation (AV)	$100,000,000	$500,000,000
Assessed Valuation per ADA	50,000	250,000
Foundation Program per ADA	643	643
District Aid (AV x 25¢) per ADA	125	625
Basic Aid per ADA	125	125
Equalization Aid per ADA	393	-
State Apportionment per ADA (Basic + Equalization)	518	125

State aid varies according to district financial ability (AV/ADA). With a 25¢ local tax effort, the poor district ("A") is guaranteed $643 per student, whereas the wealthier district ("B") is guaranteed $750. This is due to the variation in local resources. District B receives only state "basic aid," but it is able to raise more district aid (local resources) than district A. Further, the funding level has little correlation with the actual expenditure per student which a Community College district requires to meet the needs and preferences of its constituents. The average expenditure per student in the Community College system is estimated at $850 during 1970-71. To achieve this level would require tax rates of 66¢ in district A but only 29¢ in district B. This discrepancy between the Foundation Program level and actual expenditures is accentuated if district A exhibits inherently high costs (well beyond the $850 average) while district B is relatively low cost.

Because of these inequities, the poorer district with fewer local resources may find it less expensive to retain students refusing to grant releases and, thereby denying its own residents the breadth of educational opportunity often provided by a wealthier district. State support is calculated upon the local wealth of the student's district of residence then credited to the district which he actually attends. The poorer district (A) loses a total of $518 for each student it releases ($125 basic aid + $393 equalization aid). The wealthy district (B), however, loses only basic aid ($125 per ADA) because it does not qualify for equalization aid. Movement of students from district B to district A is discouraged for the same reason. The poor district receives considerably less state aid ($125 basic aid) for each unit of ADA it accepts from district B, while B receives $518 total state funds for each unit it enrolls from district A. Thus, district B is placed in a difficult position. It probably has fewer educational programs but cannot afford to permit its residents to obtain opportunities elsewhere nor admit students from wealthier districts. This situation possibly hinders the poorer district in its efforts at program development.

Apportionment constitutes the state contribution to Community College operating expenditures. The state also participates in capital outlay programs through the Junior College Construction Act of 1967 (Sec. 20050 - 20083, Ed.C.). Each district is required to submit a ten-year Master Plan to justify its facility requirements and the appropriate amount of state construction funds. Determination of need, however, depends heavily upon enrollment expressed in weekly student contact hours. Consequently, districts - especially those which are a poor or underdeveloped district - are often encouraged to retain students to maintain current utilization standards, strengthen requests for facilities and obtain state monies available for construction.

Attempts to solve these financial deterrents need to replace the inequities of the present system with fiscal incentives for regional planning. Possible remedies include the additional equalization of local wealth inherent in increasing the Foundation Program and/or a statewide property tax. Both proposals - especially the latter - need additional study prior to implementation. The scope of this review must exceed considerations for regional planning due to its statewide implications.

Another possibility to be considered is the calculation and apportionment of state aid on the basis of student's district of attendance rather than his district of residence. Under this plan, state aid would be paid to districts where students are actually generating program costs. Under this alternative procedure, the deterrents to student movement between districts of differing financial ability would largely be removed.

There is precedent for this plan. The Community College Construction Act of 1967 provides for a district to determine its facility needs on the basis of all students it services regardless of the district of residence. During the 1969 session, the legislature passed Senate Bill 493 (Deukmejian); it provides this apportionment procedure for police science classes when 50% or more of such students were residents of other districts. Recent legislation (Senate Bill 1277 - Grunsky), signed by the governor, permits the use of "enrolled" rather than resident weekly student contact hours for determining relative district ability and the consequent district and state share for funding Community College construction projects.

Another possibility is either an increase in the statutory maximum tax of 35¢ per $100 of assessed valuation (Sec. 20816, Ed.C.) or elimination of maximum tax rates altogether. The major problems with this procedure stem from the apparent unwillingness and inability of the individual taxpayer to increase his current contribution.

Other possibilities might include the development of methods establishing reciprocity of the flow of dollars between districts or eliminating fund exchanges that normally result from student transfers. The latter, perhaps including some state subsidy to assist districts in maintaining expensive programs, provides another approach to overcoming current fiscal incentives. Implications of these and other alternatives would need to be studied fully prior to implementation.

LEGAL DETERRENTS

Local districts may exercise only powers specifically delegated to them or necessarily implied from these expressed powers. This restricts the planning and fiscal commitments of a district. All districts, however, have the authority to plan their curricula, consider regional needs in that plan, and expend funds to prepare and implement the plan. Consequently, negotiating a compact which includes developing curricula on a regional basis and permitting a free flow of students among districts to take advantage of educational opportunities constitutes a legitimate exercise of such powers.

A district, however, must maintain its schools within its own territory (Sec. 5011, Ed.C.) except in very restricted circumstances. Classes in driver training may be offered outside district boundaries, or if a district reports an acute shortage of teachers or buildings, it may request permission to conduct classes outside its territory (Sec. 5023 - 5024 Ed.C.). Other circumstances include providing educational opportunities for military personnel as well as persons affected by special wartime activities, and holding special classes on National Service Land or other federal facilities (Sec. 5025 - 5027 Ed.C.). A district may also offer classes outside its boundaries if necessary facilities are not available within the district (Sec. 25508 Ed.C.) or current facilities are inadequate due to the failure of the voters to authorize issuance of bonds for the required construction (Sec. 25589 Ed.C.). The governing board of a high school district may request a Community College district to offer classes in its territory upon the approval of the County Board of Education and the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges (Sec. 25508.5 Ed.C.). Finally, the Education Code (Sec. 25509.5) permits these activities for specified aircraft pilot training programs outside district boundaries if operating within district territory violates federal law or regulation.

These provisions do not provide for the construction and maintenance of permanent and comprehensive facilities or colleges outside district territory. This barrier cannot be overcome through the execution of a joint powers agreement. Public agencies can execute a joint powers agreement (Sec. 6502, Gov. Code), but it cannot be authorized by school districts for operating a comprehensive permanent facility outside the boundaries. In any joint venture of this nature the facility would be out-of-district for most participants and, thus, the cooperating districts would be exceeding their legal powers. Further, the Community College Construction Act of 1967 authorizes the use of state funds for "districts." The joint powers agency

created to operate this comprehensive facility is not a district. It was not so created and does not meet legal specifications for establishing a district. Moreover, it does not have the same powers as a district and, therefore, would be ineligible for state financial assistance. Such an agency, then, would have to build its "community college" with federal, tax, or bond funds alone.[1]

The Education Code does not provide for sharing responsibility and liability of jointly constructed and operated facilities. Application of Code provisions to joint operations would cause several problems. Construction and operation of a joint facility would create difficult fiscal questions including legitimate sources for operating revenues and appropriate tax and bonding authority. Joint operation raises numerous questions. Which district receives the credit for ADA? Whose assessed property is involved? What property is liable on the bonds for the joint facilities? The joint powers agency which controls this facility has no taxable property to support the college or retire the bonds nor has it boundaries from which to enroll students. The Construction Act of 1967 contains no provisions for two districts to share the responsibility for planning, construction, and payment. The state share of costs is based on assessed valuation and students within the district. In a joint arrangement, it is not clear whose assessed valuation and students would be used in the computation. Furthermore, the construction plans are based upon need as expressed by estimated enrollment. Since the joint powers agency is not a district, enrollment estimates are very difficult.

Problems of liability and control arise from lack of guidelines for sharing responsibility of jointly constructed and operated facilities. The liability of each district is not indicated. It is not clear which district would bear legal responsibility for any action brought against the joint powers agency. There would also be the difficulty of determining the electorate eligible to vote on issues

---

[1] This also restricts the manner in which a district may "use" a facility constructed by another district. There are two distinct possible meanings of the term "use." One district can "use" the facility of another by sending its residents to a college in another district. This presents a situation which is similar to that which now exists through the use of interdistrict attendance agreements. This "use" of facilities is clearly within the structure of existing law. A district can also "use" the facilities of another district by exercising direct control over them and treating them as part of district facilities. The latter raises a number of legal problems. In effect, it means that the district is maintaining facilities and conducting classes outside of its territory. As such, the barriers noted above must be overcome.

raised concerning the facility. Finally, the critical problem of control would need to be resolved. Under a joint operation, who controls the hiring, firing, purchasing, enrollment, and curricula; or issues the degree? Who has the ultimate responsibility for policy determinations? Is it the obligation of the boards of all participating districts? If so, how many votes would be needed? Similar problems are associated with the administration of a joint facility. The administrative effectiveness of the board's executive officer might be hindered by the varying interests of participating districts. Procedures would also have to be devised to integrate the administration of the joint operation with existing policies and administrations of the participants. These deterrents would need to be overcome through enabling legislation if a joint powers arrangement were to be useful. This may be accomplished through amendments to the Education Code or a unified legislative package. However, adding amendments to the Code might create serious legal inconsistencies. Therefore, the best solution might be a comprehensive legislative proposal giving districts the operational and fiscal authority to maintain such facilities.

JURISDICTIONAL DETERRENTS

Student movement between districts and effective regional planning requres a commitment from local boards, administrators and communities. This commitment requires a willingness to participate in cooperative endeavors with other districts in addition to responding to the needs and preferences of the local community. The commitment also requires that districts consider the needs and efforts of their neighbors and the state. Available evidence suggests that districts generally have been unwilling to expand sufficiently the range of their planning about curricula and fiscal affairs in order to bring about a viable regional operation. Historically, local boards have established policy for their district, and have seldom been required to consider larger area or statewide concerns.

The problem, therefore, involves the possible conflict between the commitment to equal educational opportunity and the issue of control. This is not unique to California. Proposals for interstate cooperation by agencies such as the New England Board of Higher Education or the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education have been compromised if not negated by this problem. Reports of these organizations indicate the reluctance of states to relinquish territorial and educational prerogatives so as to facilitate regional planning and student flow. There appears to be a correlation between readiness of a state or district to reduce its jurisdictional powers and the degree

of potential advantage -- especially financial -- which is involved. If a state or district is convinced it will benefit from a realignment of boundaries, it is far more agreeable to relinquish control. If a transfer or annexation of territory seems detrimental to district interests, the proposed changes will normally be resisted.

Proposed permanent-cooperative-ventures generally meet with the following questions: Who would control the curriculum and facilities? Would out-of-district students be given equal treatment with residents? How would conflicting board policies be resolved? How does one cope with serious community pressure? What would be the penalties for withdrawal? Given the fact of local autonomy and board control, what would prevent a district from refusing to accept a decision of a regional agency? What portion of the local budget should be expended on such a venture without serious concerns from the community?

None of these problems is insoluble. Many can be solved by mutual understanding and confidence. As noted in Chapter III, many districts are moving in this direction through cooperative meetings to discuss common problems and develop realistic solutions. Such efforts have merit and should be encouraged throughout the state to maximize educational opportunity for all citizens of California.

ATTITUDINAL DETERRENTS

Historically, the Community College has served its community or district. There is no common definition of a "community," but district boards, administrators and residents tend to emphasize differences rather than similarities among adjoining areas. There is also a tendency to protect and preserve local traditions. Such factors tend to discourage increased student flow and regional planning. Residents of some communities feel that an influx of unrestricted numbers of out-of-district students would dilute community identity. It also would undermine one of the primary functions of the local college, i.e. to assist residents to understand the needs and problems of their community. Implied in this concept is a commitment by the local resident to upgrade the community through the education received at the local college. This desirable goal cannot be achieved if free flow were implemented because the students and graduates would neither work nor live in the area. Moreover, certain geographical areas are considered to be more desirable than others. Colleges situated near four-year institutions or in desirable locations such as the Monterey Penninsula would attract an excess number of students.

This would cause further dislocation of local traditions and community identity. This problem is complicated by the inability of local citizens to integrate statewide concerns and needs with local priorities. Occasionally, free flow of students and regional planning are considered as instances of statewide concerns which do not give sufficient consideration to community needs. Consequently, evidence indicates that free flow and regional planning would probably meet with opposition if implemented on a major scale. Although many of these convictions appear to be emotional, they have sufficient influence to undermine efforts to pass bond issues and tax overrides.

Boards and administrators must consider the needs and preferences of their residents. Approximately two-thirds of the funding of Community Colleges is derived from local revenue. A district, therefore, has primary responsibility to the local taxpayer. This tends to discourage free flow and regional planning since otherwise district taxpayers would be paying for the education of students from other districts. This tends to dilute the educational opportunities and community benefits that taxpayers may derive from their own local college.

The attitudinal barrier is the most difficult to combat because of its intangible nature. It appears to be primarily a problem of gradually educating boards, administrators, and the community to the possible benefits of area planning.

CHAPTER V
ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INCREASING STUDENT FLOW AND REGIONAL PLANNING

The following alternatives are designed to alleviate two interrelated problems: (1) the case of the student who is unable to obtain a desired program due either to the unwillingness of the district of residence to grant a release or reluctance on the part of another district to admit the student to its college(s); and (2) the district that cannot fund certain programs due to high initial or fixed cost and possibly low enrollment. These alternative arrangements would incorporate the need for maximum flexibility because of differences in local conditions. They are not totally new or untried. A few districts currently operate modified forms of these exchange and planning arrangements. Implementation of these alternatives would permit empirical evaluation of an untested assumption: regional planning and interdistrict cooperation will maintain or possibly increase present levels of student access and community service while increasing economic efficiency. Implementation also will require funding for staff planning and coordination beyond that for which districts currently budget.

Also related to each alternative is possible legislation to base state apportionments upon a student's district of enrollment, rather than his district of residence. As noted in Chapter IV, this would remove the deterrent to student flow inherent in current apportionments. Districts now receive part of their equalization aid based upon the financial ability of other districts.

REGIONAL RESIDENCY (CLOSEST COLLEGE CONCEPT)[1]

The first alternative, that of "regional residency" or the "closest college concept," would permit a simple but comprehensive student exchange based upon proximity. It offers students an opportunity to attend a college in another district when that college is geographically more accessible. This plan could be coordinated at a regional level by districts under a joint powers agreement (Sec. 6500 Gov. Code) or, perhaps more effectively, by an agreement simply stating the conditions of the arrangement. This agreement would establish the number of eligible students who could be accommodated at the colleges within the region. Ideally, no restrictions would be placed

---

[1] This concept and the regional curricula concept are developed in Interstate Cooperation at the Community College Level (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1969) and New England Regional Student Program 1971-1972 (New England Board of Higher Education, 1971).

upon the number of students involved nor would a participant be denied admission because of his residence or reasons for requesting admission. The major objective would be to establish a reciprocal attendance policy based upon student need. Several variations could be initiated to make the program flexible. The number of enrolees at any college within the region could be established on the basis of a percentage quota or an absolute numerical minimum by institution or district. Reciprocal arrangements are also possible. These may be based upon student needs without limitation to numbers or determined by an agreement which would stipulate the maximum permissible difference between the incoming and outgoing students. If the sending district exceeded its quota, it would reimburse the receiving institution for numbers in excess of the reciprocal amount.

Regional residency on the closest college concept would provide a number of students with increased opportunity to attend adjacent colleges. This would be particularly beneficial and effective for students living near district borders where a natural flow is frequently curbed by an interdistrict attendance agreement. This model has two additional assets. It would be easy to administer once a region was established and would not involve additional state appropriations or the transfer of large amounts of local funds. Finally, it recognizes the true service area of a Community College without undue regard to district boundaries. This alternative would seem to be most applicable to a region which has few districts that may be large in area but small in enrollments and where factors of geography, inadequate local resources, and isolation constitute serious deterrents to meeting the educational needs of the region.

REGIONAL CURRICULA

The second alternative, regional curricula, could supplement the closest college concept. Regional curricula involves area-wide agreements to establish specific high-cost programs at designated colleges in an effort to avoid unnecessary duplication of these programs, unless need could be clearly demonstrated by manpower requirements of the region. The selection of additional "regional curricula" would be based upon the desire of districts to increase regional visibility for outstanding programs or recruit additional students for high cost and/or low enrollment programs. Implementing this alternative might involve the creation of a joint powers agency. However, participating districts may choose to develop and implement a curriculum plan for the region under a less complex arrangement. District representatives would identify regional curricula, indicate the number of spaces available to out-of-district students, and arrange for a regional counselling program to advertise the opportunities. Periodically, district representatives would review and revise the regional curricula based upon demand and evaluation of existing pro-

grams. Finally, a series of interdistrict attendance agreements could regulate enrollment in these curricula according to pre-arranged enrollment priorities.

Programs selected as regional curricula would normally be high cost, often exhibiting low enrollments (particularly if offered in adjacent districts), and show evidence of substantial community need, but which cannot be totally funded by a single district. The best pilot project or test of this alternative would be in a high-population-density urban area with sufficient number of districts to generate the required enrollment.

Specific regional curricula might be funded under full-cost reimbursement contracts to eliminate possible financial disadvantages faced by the host district. Total or supplemental state funding might be appropriate, particularly in those cases where manpower needs have been clearly demonstrated. State matching funds could be available to assist the local district in meeting the added cost to establish and maintain regional curricula. This alternative has several advantages. It emphasizes program excellence, expands educational opportunity, and tends to reduce unit costs by concentrating enrollments in certain programs. It permits each district to maintain authority over curricula and avoids the jurisdictional, legal and administrative problems created by joint operation of a common facility.

APPENDIX

A. REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICTS USED FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

B. EDUCATION CODE SECTIONS ON INTER-DISTRICT AGREEMENTS

C. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS: STUDENT FLOW

D. REGIONAL ASSESSED VALUATION PER ADA

APPENDIX A
CRITERIA FOR REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICTS
INTRODUCTORY NOTE

For purposes of this study, the 68 districts were grouped into 10 regions. In the establishment of these configurations the following criteria were utilized: (1) evidence of cooperative planning submitted by the districts in compliance with federal and state guidelines, (2) geographical continguity, common population configurations, availability of transportation, job market areas, and recent cooperative planning efforts cited in interdistrict attendance policies and related documents. It should be noted, however, that these criteria are not exhaustive and no regional demarcation is considered as final. It is assumed that member districts may and do have cooperative arrangements with districts in other regions.

APPENDIX A
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRICTS
USED FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

REGION	Districts	Total	Colleges	Total	Counties	Total
I	Butte	6	Butte	6	Butte	6
	Lassen		Lassen		Lassen	
	Peralta		Feather River		Plumas	
	Shasta		Shasta		Shasta	
	Siskiyous		Siskiyous		Siskiyou	
	Yuba		Yuba		Yuba	
II	Napa	4	Napa	4	Napa	4
	Solano		Solano		Solano	
	Sonoma		Sonoma		Sonoma	
	Redwoods		Redwoods		Humboidt	
III	Contra Costa	7	(Contra Costa	12	Contra Costa	6
			(Diablo Valley			
	Freemont-Newark		Ohlone		Alameda	
	Marin		Marin		Marin	
	San Francisco		SFCC		San Francisco	
	Peralta		(Alameda		Alameda	
			(Laney			
			(Merritt			
	San Mateo		(Canada		San Mateo	
			(San Mateo			
			(Skyline			
	South County		Chabot		Alameda	
IV	Cabrillo	7	Cabrillo	8	Santa Cruz	3
	Gavilan		Gavilan		Santa Clara	
	Foothill		(De Anza		Santa Clara	
			(Foothill			
	Hartnell		Hartnell		Monterey	
	Monterey Pen.		M.P.C.		Monterey	
	San Jose		San Jose C.C.		Santa Clara	
	West Valley		West Valley		Santa Clara	

REGION	Districts	Total	Colleges	Total	Counties	Total
V	Kern	6	(Bakersfield (Porterville	7	Kern	4
	Merced Sequoias State Center		Merced Sequoias (Fresno (Reedley		Merced Tulare Fresno Fresno	
	West Kern West Hills		West Kern West Hills		Kern Fresno	
VI	Los Rios	4	(American River (Consumnes (Sac. City	7	Sacramento El Dorado	6-8
	San Joaquin Delta Sierra		San Joaquin Sierra		San Joaquin (Placer (Nevada	
	Yosemite		(Columbia (Modesto		Stanislaus	
VII	Allan Hancock Santa Barbara San Luis Obispo Ventura	4	Allan Hancock Santa Barbara San Luis Obispo (Ventura (Moorpark	5	Santa Barbara Santa Barbara San Luis Obispo Ventura	3
VIII	Antelope Valley Los Angeles	3	Antelope Valley (East L.A. (L.A. City (L.A. Harbor (L.A. Pierce (L.A. Southwest (L.A. Valley (West L.A.	9	Los Angeles	1
	Santa Clarita		Santa Clarita (College of the Canyons)		Los Angeles	

REGIONS	Districts	Total	Colleges	Total	Counties	Total
VIII-1	Cerritos Compton El Camino Long Beach Santa Monica North Orange	9	Cerritos Compton El Camino Long Beach Santa Monica (Cypress (Fullerton	11	Los Angeles Orange	2
	Orange Coast		(Orange Coast (Golden West		Orange	
	Saddleback Santa Ana		Saddleback Santa Ana		Orange	
VIII-2	Citrus Chaffey Mt. San Antonio Rio Hondo North Orange	7	Citrus Chaffey Mt. San Antonio Rio Hondo (Fullerton (Cypress	8	Los Angeles San Bernardino Los Angeles Los Angeles Orange	3
	Glendale Pasadena		Glendale Pasadena		Los Angeles Los Angeles	
IX	Chaffey Barstow Victor Valley San Bernardino Coachella Mt. San Jacinto Palo Verde Riverside	8	Chaffey Barstow Victor Valley San Bernardino San Bernardino San Bernardino San Bernardino San Bernardino	4	San Bernardino Riverside	2
X	Imperial Grossmont Oceanside/Carlsbad Palomar San Diego U.	6	Imperial Grossmont Oceanside/Carlsbad Palomar (San Diego City (San Diego Evening (San Diego Mesa	8	Imperial San Diego	2
	Sweetwater		Southwestern			

APPENDIX B
EDUCATION CODE SECTIONS ON
INTERDISTRICT AGREEMENTS

Determination of Residence for Community College Attendance Purposes

25505.1. Residence for Community College attendance purposes shall be determined in accordance with Government Code Sections 243 and 244 except that:

(a) If an unmarried minor resides with a parent, the residence of the minor shall be that of the parent with whom he is residing.

(b) The residence of an unmarried minor who for at least two years has been in the continuous direct care and control of and has lived with an adult resident of the state other than his parent, shall be that of such adult resident.

(c) A married woman may establish her own residence.

(d) An apprentice as defined in Section 3077 of the Labor Code may establish his own residence.

(Added by Stats. 1965, Ch. 1876.)

Admission to Community College in Another District

25505.3. Subject to the provisions of Sections 25503 to 25504.5, inclusive, a district resident shall be admitted to a Community College in another district unless such admission would be contrary to the terms of an interdistrict attendance agreement or a notice of restriction.

(Added by Stats. 1965, Ch. 1876.)

Interdistrict Attendance Agreements

25505.4.

(a) An interdistrict attendance agreement may be entered into between two districts specifying the terms and conditions under which district residents of one district may attend a Community College in the other district. The agreement may be for any period agreed upon but for not less than one year.

(b) Tuition charges including charges for use of buildings and equipment may be specified as part of the terms and conditions of an interdistrict attendance agreement. Such charges shall be not less than the apportionments provided by the state to the district of attendance because of attendance of students under the agreement nor shall such charges be more than would be computed as specified in Section 20201.

(c) If either district is within the first three years of its existence and has not acquired facilities from a preceding district, the $300 charge for use of buildings and equipment specified in Section 20201 shall not be charged to either district.

(Added by Stats. 1965, Ch. 1876.)

Notice of Restriction

25505.5. A district may restrict admission of its residents in a Community College of another district or it may restrict admission of residents of another district into its Community College or colleges by means of a notice of restriction. The notice of restriction shall be sent to the district to which it applies, to the county superintendent of each county containing all or part of both districts, and shall be published in the catalogue of the district issuing the notice and of the district to which the notice applies. A notice of restriction shall be effective with the school session immediately following the next succeeding April 1 after receipt of the notice by the district to which it is directed. It shall continue in effect until withdrawn. A district receiving a notice of restriction shall not permit attendance contrary to the notice.

(Added by Stats. 1963, Ch. 100; amended by Stats. 1963, Ch. 985; repealed and added by Stats. 1965, Ch. 1876.)

Student's Appeal to County Board

25505.6. If within 30 days after having requested permission to enroll in a Community College of another district, a resident student is not permitted to attend because of the terms of an interdistrict attendance agreement or a notice of restriction, an appeal may be made to the county board of education in the county of the student's residence. The appeal may be made by the student, his parent, or his guardian.

Within 30 days after the filing of the appeal the county board of education or its delegated representative shall grant or deny the appeal.

If the appeal is granted and attendance is allowed, the district of residence shall pay tuition to the district of attendance in accordance with an interdistrict attendance agreement which is in effect between the districts. In the absence of an interdistrict attendance agreement and subject to the provisions of Section 25505.4(c) the rate of tuition shall be computed as specified in Section 20201 including the specified $300 charge per unit of average daily attendance for use of buildings and equipment.

(Added by Stats. 1965, Ch. 1876.)

Nonresident Tuition; Exemptions;
Computation; Report and Exception

25505.8. A district may admit and shall charge a tuition fee to nonresident students. The district may exempt from all or parts of the fee nonresidents who (a) enroll for six units or less, (b) are both citizens and residents of a foreign country, or (c) are military personnel or the dependents of military personnel. Any exemptions shall be made with regards to all nonresidents described in (a), or (b), or (c) above, and shall not be made on an individual basis.

A district may, without the approval of the Superintendent of Public Instruction contract with a state, the federal government, a foreign country,or an agency thereof, for payment of all or a part of a nonresident student's tuition fee.

The nonresident tuition fee shall be paid in two equal installments at the beginning of each semester, or three equal installments at the beginning of each quarter and shall be set by the

State Board of Education not later than January 1st of each year. The fee shall represent the amount per student enrolled in Community Colleges in all the districts of the state, which is expended by all the districts from district tax funds for the costs of instruction as defined by the California School Accounting Manual for pupils enrolled in grades 13 and 14.

The amount per pupil enrolled shall be derived by dividing the costs of instruction expended from district funds during the preceding year by the quotient of the average daily attendance during the same year in grades 13 and 14 of all districts maintaining Community Colleges in the state divided by 1.2. The same fee shall be charged irrespective of the type of class in which the student is enrolled.

The State Board of Education shall also adopt a per-unit tuition fee for nonresidents on less than a full-time basis by dividing the fee for full-time nonresidents by 30 (units). The same per-unit rate shall be charged all nonresident students attending any summer sessions maintained by the Community College.

A district shall report annually to the State Department of Education the number of nonresidents enrolled for six units or less, the number of nonresidents enrolled for more than six units, and the total amount of fees collected from each category.

The provisions of this section which require a mandatory fee for nonresidents shall not apply to any district in which during the school year 1962-63 more than 25 percent of the students enrolled were residents of another state; except that the provisions of this section shall apply to such districts beginning with the school year 1970-71 and except that the provisions of this section which require annual reports to be filed with the State Department of Education on the number of such students enrolled shall apply to such districts in the same manner as to any other district.

(Added by Stats. 1965, Ch. 1876.)

Apprentices Exemption From Nonresident Fee

25505.15. No fee may be charged to any apprentice who is not a resident of California for attendance in a California Community College in classes of related and supplemental instruction as provided under Section 3074 of the Labor Code and in accord with the requirements as set forth in subdivision (d) of Section 3078 of that code.

(Added by Stats. 1965, Ch. 860.)

Table 1

INTERDISTRICT ATTENDANCE AGREEMENTS

REGION	Districts	Major Classification of Exchange Agreements: Free	Limited Free: Units	Limited Free: Students	Limited Free: ADA	Limited Free: Evening	Full Cost Without "Seat Fee"	Full Cost With "Seat Fee"	Policy Determinants for Release-Acceptance: College Nearest Residence	Course/ Curriculum Unavailable	Financial Personal Hardship	Other
I	6	5	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	4	0
II	4	2	3	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	3	0
III	7	5	3	0	0	0	3	6	2	7	7	4
IV	7	5	2	0	2	2	7	5	4	7	5	4
V	6	6	0	8	3	0	3	3	5	8	8	5
VI	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	3	0
VII	4	3	2	1	1	0	1	2	4	4	4	3
VIII	3	3	1	1	1	0	2	2	3	3	3	0
VIII-1	9*	7	2	1	0	0	3	8	5	8	6	2
VIII-2	7*	5	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	5	3	1
IX	8*	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	7	8	7	7
X	6	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	4	4	1
TOTAL		56	19	13	10	7	24	36	43	65	57	27
PERCENTAGE		82%	28%	19%	14%	10%	35%	53%	63%	95%	83%	39%

NOTE: (1) One district may have any combination of the above policies. These totals will not be 100%. Figures in columns indicate the number of districts within the region that have such agreements with other districts.

(2) The Percentage factor indicates the number of districts that have a policy expressed as a percent of all 68 districts.

*Due to the proximity of the Community College in Orange and Los Angeles Counties, Regions VIII through VIII-2 (North Orange and Chafey) have been counted twice as interregional.

APPENDIX C

TABLE 2

INTERDISTRICT ATTENDANCE AGREEMENTS
NOTICES OF RESTRICTION

REGION	Districts	Restriction	Policy Determinants			
		Notices	Adverse Financial Effect	Adverse Educational Effect	Ethnic Imbalance	Over-Crowding of Facilities
I	6	2	2	2	0	0
II	5	2	2	1	0	1
III	7	6	4	5	1	0
IV	6	6	6	1	0	3
V	6	5	4	0	0	2
VI	4	4	2	1	0	1
VII	4	2	0	0	0	2
VIII	3	2	2	2	0	0
VIII-1	7	3	3	2	1	2
VIII-2	7	3	3	1	0	0
IX	8	3	3	2	0	1
X	6	2	2	1	0	0
TOTAL RESTRICTING DISTRICTS		40	33	18	2	12
PERCENTAGE OF RESTRICTING DISTRICTS (40)		100%	82%	45%	.05%	30%
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DISTRICTS (68)		59%	48%	26%	.03%	17.%

TABLE 3

STUDENT FLOW RELATED
TO STUDY REGIONS 1968-69

Region	Net ADA Within Region	INTRAREGIONAL Net Student Flow	Percentage *	Ranking **	Percentage Statewide ***	Ranking **	INTERREGIONAL Net Student Flow	Percentage *	Ranking **	Percentage Statewide ***	Ranking **
I	9,769	208	2.1	5	0.9	10	371	3.8	2	1.6	8
II	14,486	264	1.8	6	1.1	9	405	2.8	4	1.7	7
III	71,350	1,663	2.3	4	7.2	2	1,291	1.8	6	5.6	2
IV	36,881	786	2.1	5	3.4	5	337	0.9	9	1.5	9
V	25,405	391	1.5	7	1.7	8	584	2.3	5	2.5	5
VI	36,313	484	1.3	8	2.1	7	500	1.4	8	2.2	6
VII	18,976	122	0.6	9	0.5	12	330	1.7	7	1.4	10
VIII	71,612	132	0.18	10	0.6	11	7,529	10.5	1	32.4	1
VIII-1	76,469	1,854	2.4	3	8.0	1	1,303	1.7	7	5.6	2
VIII-2	43,619	1,294	3.0	2	5.6	3	1,204	2.8	4	5.2	3
IX	21,293	506	2.4	3	2.2	6	678	3.2	3	2.9	4
X	36,250	1,276	3.5	1	5.5	4	327	0.9	9	1.4	10

* Computed by $\frac{\text{Net Student Flow}}{\text{Net ADA}}$

** Based on percentage of student movement

*** Computed by $\frac{\text{Statewide Student Flow}}{\text{Statewide ADA}} = \frac{23,839}{462,423} = 5.2\%$

NOTE: Figures for Net Student Flow do not include defined adults since necessary data for this computation was not available.

SOURCE: Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports, Department of Education

APPENDIX D

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
REGIONAL ASSESSED VALUATION PER ADA
FROM 2ND PRINCIPAL APPORTIONMENT
(Spring - 1970)

Region	Assessed Valuation as of June 2, 1970	Total ADA	Assessed Valuation Per ADA	Regional Ranking
I	$ 1,181,609,306	9,769	$120,955	4
II	1,279,536,753	14,486	88,380	9
III	8,949,644,439	71,350	125,177	2
IV	3,784,693,690	36,881	102,619	7
V	3,142,441,750	25,405	123,693	3
VI	3,090,073,780	36,313	85,096	10
VII	2,026,453,732	18,976	106,791	5
VIII	10,695,808,288	71,612	149,358	1
VIII-1	7,044,852,610	76,469	92,127	8
VIII-2	4,751,696,348	43,619	84,080	11
IX	2,678,731,460	21,293	106,017	6
X	2,615,829,492	36,250	72,161	12

SOURCE: Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports, Department of Education